

allows different concentrator and different separator heating elements to be utilized, which allows different groups of gases to be separated and detected. For example, see the specification at page 19, line 18 through page 20, line 12. Further, Applicants submit that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the sensor of Boone by adding separator heating elements and a ratio control mechanism. The only motivation for making such a change appears to be found in Applicants' specification, which is improper.

Additionally, even if one were to duplicate the single separator heating element of Boone, one would not arrive at the claimed fluid sensor because Boone also fails to teach concentrator and separator heating elements in a pre-arranged pattern, or a number of separator heater elements corresponding to the number of concentrator heater elements, or a ratio control mechanism as indicated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 8-10, and 25-27 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bonne in view of Kubisiak. The Examiner acknowledges that Bonne fails to teach a second detector or a flow sensor, or a processor on a separate board from the concentrator, separator and phased heater array. Kubisiak is cited for teaching a detector and flow sensor connected to a processor comprising switches and control logic, where the detector is used to measure fluid properties. The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Bonne with the processor and switches of Kubisiak in order to control the timing of the activation of the different

heating elements and to gain the additional advantage of determining the phase lag and fluid properties. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.


For at least the reasons set forth above, Bonne does not appear to teach the basic elements of independent claims 1 and 22, from which claims 3-10 and 25-29 depend. Kubisiak does not appear to provide what Bonne lacks, thus any combination of Bonne and Kubisiak also fails to teach each and every element of the claims. Further, even if one were to combine the teachings of Bonne and Kubisiak, one would not arrive at the claimed invention. None of the references appear to teach or suggest a fluid sensor having a first plurality of heating elements in a concentrator and a second plurality of heating elements in a separator, or a ratio control mechanism as claimed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested. It is submitted that, in light of the above remarks, all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance. If a telephone interview would be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at 612-677-9050.

Application Serial No. 10/671,930  
Reply to Office Action dated April 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 07-30-07

  
John G. Shudy, Jr., Reg. No. 31,214  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, MN 55403-2402  
Telephone: (612) 677-9050  
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349